

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 26, 29, 46, 51 and 52 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action has objected to claim 46 because “appliance” at line two is misspelled. Claim 46 has been amended to correct the spelling of “appliance”. Accordingly, it is submitted that the amendment obviates the objection to claim 46 and, therefore, that the objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 has been amended at line three to correct a misspelling by changing “whereinthe” to “wherein the”.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 26, 32, 37, 38 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,497 to Bouthillier et al., hereafter Bouthillier.

Bouthillier concerns a user inserting a card into a receptacle in order to demonstrate his identity or his authorization, and thereby gain access to some resource that he is authorized to access due to the security configuration of the system. Bouthillier is silent as to how the security configuration is established. The paragraph beginning at column 3, line 2, seems to suggest that the security policy is set by an administrative personal computer (not shown).

In contrast, in the present invention as claimed, the placement or other physical usage of the physical key is used to control the security setup of the system, which, e.g., users (for instance) are allowed to access which devices. This is in contrast to Bouthillier, in which physical keys such as switches and smart-cards are used for authentication. In Bouthillier, a user uses a physical key primarily to prove his identity to the system. Bouthillier assumes that the security configuration of the system as to which

user is allowed to access which device is controlled through a traditional software user-interface, i.e., the above noted “administrative personal computer”.

Independent claims 1, 26 and 51 have been amended to positively recite that the “security console, based on said security-related data and said selected receptacle, establishes a network policy that determines a desired security configuration of said information system with respect to said information appliance and said security console”. Support for this amended language is found at page 9, in the paragraph beginning at line 24 of the specification. Bouthillier clearly lacks such a security console. The Examiner reads the security console on the above noted paragraph of Bouthillier, which refers to both the readykey controller 12 and the administrative personal computer. However, Bouthillier merely states that the administrative personal computer monitors readykey controller 12 “to keep track of individuals accessing computer 18 and to insure an attempt at unauthorized access of data stored in computer or available to computer 18 through a Local Area Network is not made”. This merely teaches that the activity of readykey controller 12 (receiving an “authorization signal” from an inserted card “that the user is authorized to use” computer 18 for receiving and processing data) is monitored by the administrative personal computer. There is no disclosure or teaching of establishing a network policy based on the data contained on the physical key and its receptacle of insertion as claimed in independent claims 1, 26 and 51. Thus, Bouthillier lacks an element or step recited in these amended claims and their dependent claims 8, 13, 14, 32, 37 and 38 as well.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 26, 32, 37, 38 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Bouthillier is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18-22, 27, 29, 34, 35, 39, 40 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Bouthillier in view of U.S Patent No. 6,212,635 to Reardon, hereafter Reardon (635).

This rejection is obviated by the amendment because claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18-22, 27, 29, 34, 35, 39, 40 and 42-47 depend on independent claims 1 and 26, which recite an element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier as noted in the above discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26. Reardon 635, which was cited for a different reason, does not disclose or teach the element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier. Accordingly, the suggested combination of Bouthillier and Reardon 635 lacks an element or step of claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18-22, 27, 29, 34, 35, 39, 40 and 42-47

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18-22, 27, 29, 34, 35, 39, 40 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 52 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Bouthillier in view of U.S Patent No. 6,718,319 to Fischer, Jr. et al., hereafter Fischer.

Independent claim 52 has been amended similar to independent claims 1 and 26 to recite that “based on said security-related data and said selected one of said first and second object receptacles, said security console establishes a network policy that determines a desired security configuration of said information system”. As noted above in the discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26, Bouthillier does not disclose or teach a security console that establishes a network polity as claimed. Accordingly, Bouthillier lacks this element of claim 52. This element is not taught by Fischer, which was cited for a different reason. Accordingly, the suggested combination of Bouthillier and Fischer lacks an element of amended claim 52.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 6, 7, 28, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Bouthillier in view of Reardon (635) and further in view of U.S Patent No. 5,434,562 to Reardon, hereafter Reardon (562).

This rejection is obviated by the amendment because claims 3, 6, 7, 28, 30 and 31 depend on independent claims 1 and 26, which recite an element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier as noted in the above discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26. Reardon 635 and Reardon (562), which were cited for a different reason, do not disclose or teach the element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier. Accordingly, the suggested combination of Bouthillier with Reardon 635 and Reardon (562) lacks an element or step of claims 3, 6, 7, 28, 30 and 31.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 3, 6, 7, 28, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 23-25, 33 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Bouthillier in view of Reardon (635) and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,389,542 to Flyntz, hereafter Flyntz.

This rejection is obviated by the amendment because claims 9, 23-25, 33 and 48-50 depend on independent claims 1 and 26, which recite an element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier as noted in the above discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26. Flyntz, which was cited for a different reason, does not disclose or teach the element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier. Accordingly, the suggested combination of Bouthillier with Flyntz lacks an element or step of claims 9, 23-25, 33 and 48-50.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 9, 23-25, 33 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 12, 17, 36 and 41 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Bouthillier in view of Reardon (635) and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,193,163 to Fehrman et al., hereafter Fehrman.


This rejection is obviated by the amendment because claims 12, 17, 36 and 41 depend on independent claims 1 and 26, which recite an element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier as noted in the above discussion of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26. Reardon 635 and Fehrman, which were cited for a different reason, do not disclose or teach the element or step that is lacking in Bouthillier. Accordingly, the suggested combination of Bouthillier with Reardon 635 and Fehrman lacks an element or step of claims 12, 17, 36 and 41.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 12, 17, 36 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the objection to the specification be withdrawn, that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 1-52 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 11/8/05



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500